

REMARKS

Claims 1-4, 6-9, 11, and 12 are pending in this application.

Applicants have amended claims 1, 6, 11, and 12, and have canceled claims 5 and 10.

The changes to the claims made herein do not introduce any new matter.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

As noted above, Applicants have canceled claims 5 and 10. As such, the rejection of claims 5 and 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Arai et al.* (“*Arai*”) (US 5,929,906) in view of *Takahashi et al.* (“*Takahashi*”) (US 6,987,567 B2) is moot.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the rejection of claims 1-4, 6-9, 11, and 12 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Arai* in view of *Takahashi*, and further in view of *Yamamoto* (US 2002/0158933 A1). As will be explained in more detail below, the combination of *Arai* in view of *Takahashi* and *Yamamoto* would not have rendered the subject matter defined in independent claims 1, 6, 11, and 12, as amended herein, obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art.

Applicants have amended each of independent claims 1, 6, 11, and 12 to recite an “image quality index including *both of* a graininess index (GI) indicating graininess of a print and an ink amount index indicating an ink usage amount.” Support for the changes made to the independent claims can be found in Applicants’ specification at, for example, Paragraph [0058].

In support of the obviousness rejection, the Examiner relies upon the *Yamamoto* reference as teaching an image quality index including *either one of* a graininess index (GI) indicating graininess of a print and an ink amount index indicating an ink usage amount (see the Office Action at page 13). The *Yamamoto* reference, however, does not disclose or suggest an ink amount index indicating an ink usage amount. Thus, the *Yamamoto* reference would not have suggested to one having ordinary skill in the art an image quality index

including *both* of a graininess index (GI) indicating graininess of a print and an ink amount index indicating an ink usage amount. As such, the combination of *Arai* in view of *Takahashi* and *Yamamoto* would not have rendered the subject matter defined in present claims 1, 6, 11, and 12 obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art.

Accordingly, independent claims 1, 6, 11, and 12, as amended herein, are patentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over the combination of *Arai* in view of *Takahashi* and *Yamamoto*. Claims 2-4, each of which depends from claim 1, and claims 7-9, each of which depends from claim 6, are likewise patentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over the combination of *Arai* in view of *Takahashi* and *Yamamoto* for at least the same reasons set forth above regarding the applicable independent claim.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and reexamination of claims 1-4, 6-9, 11, and 12, as amended herein, and submit that these claims are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, a notice of allowance is respectfully requested. In the event a telephone conversation would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner may reach the undersigned at **(408) 749-6902**. If any additional fees are due in connection with the filing of this paper, then the Commissioner is authorized to charge such fees to Deposit Account No. 50-0805 (Order No. MIPFP062).

Respectfully submitted,
MARTINE PENILLA & GENCARELLA, L.L.P.



Peter B. Martine
Reg. No. 32,043

710 Lakeway Drive, Suite 200
Sunnyvale, California 94085
Customer Number 25920